UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,909	09/30/2003	George Duncan Pearson	1021-005US02	2080

51871 7590 07/28/2010

Shumaker & Sieffert, P.A.
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300
Woodbury, MN 55125

EXAMINER	
LAN, TZU-HSIANG	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/28/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pairdocketing@ssiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,909	PEARSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 June 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7-10,12,13 and 22-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7-10,12,13 and 22-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/20/10, 6/2/10*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

The following is a final office action in response to the communications received on June 02, 2010. Claims 7-10, 12-13, and 22-31 are now pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on June 18, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Adaytum-Elkin-Halliday-Heinl fails to disclose "modifying a check-out individual one of nodes of an enterprise planning model without preventing execution of an enterprise planning session for the nodes of the enterprise planning model that are not checked-out, wherein at least one of the nodes of the enterprise planning model that is not checked out receives contribution data from the checked-out individual one of the nodes, without take the model offline", examiner respectfully disagree.

Here in claim 7, Adaytum software shows capability to perform top-down and bottom up data reconciliation and it operates based on different enterprise hierarchical tier. Further, Adaytum is able to receive contribution data corresponds to one or more of the nodes of the enterprise planning model (see at least pp. 30-32 where contributor able to input day to day operational data). However, Adaytum fail to explicitly teach node level operation such as check-in and check-out nodes for modification. Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday, on the other hand, disclose detailed node level operation and hierarchically arranged nodes associated with business logic software modules and enterprise distributor (Elkin, fig. 7-9 and 14-15 display hierarchically arranged nodes associated with business logic software module such as receiving module, and claim

view module that can be linked to different level of enterprise contributor such as management level contributor and operation level contributor).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertion that Heinl fails to teach "one node of enterprise model that is not checked out receives contribution data from a checked out node of an enterprise model without taking model offline." First, the term "contribution data" is merely a non-functional descriptive label, as long as one node of enterprise model that is not checked out able to receive any data from a checked out node without taking model offline it meets the claim because, based on claim 7 limitation, contribution data is any data corresponds to one or more nodes. Second, the node level operation for online node to receive data from a checked-out node is readily disclosed by Heinl. See at least pp. 85 col. 2 ¶1 and pp. 86, col. 2 ¶5, where allowing "dirty reads" one or more of online nodes will be able to read and receive partial data from a checked-out node.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin, Heinl and Halliday. Adaytum teaches contribution data corresponds to one or more node; however, Adaytum fails to disclose detailed node level operation with respect to contribution data. Heinl shows that node level operation for one or more online node to receive partial data from a checked-out node without taking model offline is old and well known workflow modification. Since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. node level operation discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same

function in any node based operation environment, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Adaytum-Elkin-Halliday-Heinl fails to disclose "two nodes that are hierarchically related and the one of the two nodes is checked out," and "reconciling the modified second set of data with the first set of data of the modified version of the first node after the modified version of the first node has been checked in." examiner respectfully disagree.

Here, two nodes with hierarchical relationship is disclosed by Adaytum substantially where the Adaytum Planning module can automatically loads organization hierarchy and live data directly from any general ledge system (pp. 17-20), and it is further showed by Elkin in figure 7-9. To explicitly show the hierarchical enterprise structure, examiner would like to cite a teaching reference US 6308163, fig 2-3 and summary, where Du et al. show that such nodal structure for enterprise planning is old and well known.

As for reconciling the modified second set of data with first set of data, see the discussion above regarding modifying second set of data of an online node with first node's data while the first set of data is being modified offline (Heinl pp.85-86 i.e. dirty read). It is obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use dirty read function to read locked workflow type although it might create inconsistencies for the online model, the correction can be made later when first node checked in and the modified version of first set of data will update modified second set of data as shown in figure 7. Such node

level operation is clearly within capability of one of ordinary skill as disclosed by Heinl at the time of the invention.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday Since, claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. node level update and modification discussed by Heinl will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in other nodal operation environment, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Examiner would like to note the requirements for traversing official notice from MPEP § 2144.03:

> To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b).
>
> If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the

examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate

[emphasis added].

Because Applicant has not specifically pointed out any errors in the Examiner's action, the officially noticed facts in the September 2, 2008 Office Action are deemed admitted prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 7-10, 12-13, and 22-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adaytum Software ("Adaytum") in view of Elkin et al. (U.S. 2007/0179828), in view of Halliday and further in view of Heinl.

As for claim 7 Adaytum discloses software for modifying enterprise planning model including:

a enterprise planning program, executable by a computing device, for an enterprise planning session in accordance with an enterprise planning model, wherein,

the enterprise planning model defines hierarchically arranged nodes associated with business logic software modules and enterprise contributor (pp. 17-20 especially ¶18 where it discusses that Adaytum Planning module can automatically loads organization hierarchy and live data directly from any general ledge system further pp. 4-5 show that Adaytum software is designed for multiple levels of drill down in a node-level execution environment), wherein executing the enterprise session comprising:

receiving contribution data provided by the enterprise contributors, wherein the contribution data corresponds to one or more of the nodes of the enterprise planning model (Adaytum page 30-32, and 34 i.e. receiving operational data such as billing information from contributor);

reconciling the contribution data across an enterprise that corresponds to the enterprise planning model by automatically aggregating the contribution data (Adaytum, page 30-31 and 34).

While Adaytum discloses all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly teach the following limitations, however, Elkin discloses:

executing, by a computing device, an enterprise session in accordance with an enterprise model, wherein the enterprise model defines hierarchically arranged nodes associated with business logic software modules and enterprise contributors, wherein executing the enterprise planning session comprises:

receiving contribution data and automating reconciliation of the contribution data corresponds to the enterprise planning model by automatically aggregating the

contribution data as the contribution data is received and wherein the enterprise planning model comprises a financial model (see ¶¶ 13, 15, 40-41, 102-106 Fig. 3, Fig. 7-9, noting an enterprise model application allows users to define enterprise models in a hierarchical fashion, for example a mortgage financial model, data aggregation is shown in ¶ 194-198 i.e. deployment package is automatically aggregated and installed as its received [in real-time]);

checking-out an individual model for editing during execution of the enterprise planning session in accordance with the enterprise planning model (see Table 1 - list of operations, including checkout and check in); and

modifying a model without preventing execution of the enterprise planning session for the model (see ¶ 13, noting users may edit the enterprise model without affecting current enterprise operations).

While Elkin and Adaytum teach all the limitations above, they fail to explicitly teach the following limitation, however Heinl teaches:

at least one of the nodes of a workflow model that is not checked out receives contribution data from the checked-out individual one of the nodes without taking the model offline (pp. 85-86 i.e. dirty read function will enable update of an online node with data from an offline node)

Besides limitations disclosed above, examiner previously took official notice that it is old and well known to:

- Modify individual nodes of the model (Heinl, § 2.2, noting that flexibility by adaption is where a node is modified to include additional paths to other nodes; Halliday at 7, noting that tasks are individual nodes of a workflow and can be edited in a dynamic reconfiguration).
- Modify the nodes of the model without preventing execution of the session for the nodes that are not checked out (e.g., execute the enterprise planning session in accordance with the model while the modifications are occurring [i.e. dynamic modification/reconfiguration]). (Heinl at 80, first column, noting that modifications to the workflow occur in real-time, that is, while the model is still running; Halliday § 2.3 - Flexibility by adaptation: Dynamic Reconfiguration, noting tasks are modified).
- Check out individual one of the nodes (e.g., that the administration console allows an analyst to check-out individual nodes of the model for editing during execution of the enterprise planning session without taking the model offline). (Heinl, Fig. 6, noting the lock / check out policy of one node at a time A or B; § 4.2.3, noting the use of check-in / check-out).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the enterprise planning system disclosed by Adaytum with Elkin, Halliday, and Heinl's disclosure of enterprise node level operation. Both prior arts acknowledge that reconciliation of business data across enterprise hierarchical nodes is old and well known. Adaytum introduced multiple levels of drill down detail analysis

executed by enterprise planning module, but Adaytum fails to explicitly teach detailed node level execution such as node check-out step. Elkin in view of Halliday and Heinl teach detail node level operation between software modules. Since, claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. nodal operation mechanism disclosed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same node level operation in the enterprise planning system as in any other nodal workflow environment; hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As for claim 8, see the discussion in claim 7 above. While Adaytum teaches all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly teach the following, however, Elkin further teaches:

receiving updated model information for a node, and updating a respective slice of the enterprise planning model for only one of the nodes based on the updated model information (see ¶¶ 146 and 196, noting an updated process model may be overlaid on the existing process model in real-time).

Elkin fails to explicitly disclose that the nodes are checked-out. However, as shown in claim 7, node check-out is an old and well-known concept. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to specify that the updates to the model in Elkin are based on the nodes checked-out for updates, for the purpose of allowing changes to an existing model.

Further, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. software operation discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in project management or mortgage approval system, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 9, see the discussion in claim 8 above. While Adaytum teaches all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly teach the following, however, Elkin further teaches:

wherein updating the enterprise planning model comprises modifying the business logic software module or the enterprise contributor associated with the checked-out individual one of the nodes in response to the updated model information (see ¶¶ 196-198).

Elkin fails to explicitly disclose that the nodes are checked-out. However, as shown in claim 7, node check-out is an old and well-known concept. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to specify that the updates to the model in Elkin are based on the nodes checked-out for updates, for the purpose of allowing changes to an existing model.

Further, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin since claimed invention is merely a

combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. software operation discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in project management or mortgage approval system, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 10, see the discussion in claim 8 above. Adaytum further teaches:

receiving and processing the contribution data from the enterprise contributors associated with the nodes of the model during the execution of the enterprise planning session and prior to the check-out of the individual one of the nodes (Adaytum page 30-31 and 34, i.e. contribution data are received and processed from bottom-up contributors).

While Adaytum teaches all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly teach the following, however, Elkin further teaches:

updating data of the checked-out model with the contribution data in accordance with the updated model information when the check-out model is subsequently checked-in during the execution of the enterprise planning session (¶ 159-167 and table 1 i.e. checked out model is updated with and edited, then subsequently checked-in, further, ¶179-185 i.e. current edited task is later checked-in while planning session still running).

However, Elkin fails to explicitly disclose that an individual node is checked-out. However, as shown in claim 7, node check-out is an old and well-known concept.

Therefore it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to check out a node and update the node before check-in the node. Further Elkin does not explicitly teach receiving and processing contribution data from enterprise contributor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Elkin with Adaytum in view of examiner's official notice since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 12, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Adaytum further teaches:

defining reconciliation jobs for execution by an application server to prompt a reviewer to reconcile the previously received contribution data with the updated model information for the check-in individual one of the nodes (Adaytum, page 31-32 and 34 i.e. e.planning application able to prompt a reviewer to reconcile the previous data with updated model information for example, managers can input data that update a node and when check-in individual one of the nodes, the system from bottom-up reconciling the contribution data), wherein the application server is communicatively coupled to the computing device (Adaytum page 4-6).

As to claim 13, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Adaytum further teaches:

defining reconciliation jobs for execution by remote computers of the enterprise contributors to prompt at least one of the enterprise contributors to reconcile the

previously received contribution data with updated model information for the checked-in individual one of the nodes (Adaytum page 31-32 and 34 i.e. top-down planning where updated model information is escalated and reconciled).

As to claim 22, see the discussion in claim 7 above. Adaytum further teaches:

receiving a portion of the contribution data (page 31);

identifying higher levels of the hierarchically arranged nodes affected by the portion of the contribution data (Adaytum page 31-32); and

calculating new aggregate totals at each level of the hierarchically arranged nodes according to the received portion (Adaytum page 31-32 i.e. information gap is readily identified for each level of the hierarchically arranged nodes according to either top down or bottom up input).

While Adaytum teaches all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly teach the following, however, Elkin further teaches:

processing data in real time (¶ 195-198)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Elkin with Adaytum in view of examiner's official notice because implementing real-time update would enhance information synchronization across the enterprise.

As to claim 23, see the discussion in claim 12 above. Adaytum further teaches:

receiving an indication from the reviewer corresponding to the checked-in individual one of the nodes (Adaytum page 31 i.e. an administration tool will ensure submission of right information on time, which implies that indication for wrong information would be filtered); wherein an indication indicates whether the reviewer accepted or rejected the contribution data for the checked-in individual one of the nodes (page 31 i.e. right information is ensured which implicitly express administration tool filters contribution data for the checked-in one of the nodes).

As to claims 24 and 28, Adaytum and Elkin disclose the claimed invention substantially. All the limitation of claim 24 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 1, and are therefore rejected on the same basis, with following noted exceptions that are further address by Adaytum, Elkin, Heinl and Halliday. Here, Adaytum further teaches:

a computer readable medium (pp. 7-8) comprising:

associating a first set of data with the first node and a second set of data with second node (pp. 11 and 30-31 i.e. node at different level of enterprise has different data set i.e. department level node and managerial level node have different data). While Adaytum implicitly teaches hierarchical node and data relationship (pp. 17-20 especially pp.18); Examiner would like to bring in a teaching reference to show that hierarchical node and data relationship is old and well known (US Patent 6308163 see at least figure 2-3)

While Adaytum teaches the limitation above, Adaytum fail to explicitly teach the following, however, Elkin further teaches:

receiving an update to the enterprise planning model, wherein the update identifies the first node (¶ 162-163);

checking-out, the first node after receiving the update to the enterprise model (¶ 161-166, 168 and table 1 zoom in and check out the first node for edit); and

Heinl further teaches:

checking-in, a modified version of the first node after modifying the second set of data for the second node, wherein the modified version of the first node corresponds to the received update to the enterprise planning model (pp. 84-85 especially under 4.2.2 where first node is checked in and received update to the enterprise model to resolve incompatibility); and

reconcile the modified second set of data with the modified version of the first set of data after first node has been checked in (pp. 85-86 i.e. user of the system will be able to user dirty read function to read locked workflow type although it might create inconsistencies for the online model, the correction can be made when first node checked in and the modified version of first set of data will update modified second set of data as shown in figure 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday because Adaytum introduced multiple levels of drill down detail analysis executed by enterprise planning

module, but Adaytum fails to explicitly teach detailed node level execution. However, Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday show that node level modification as disclosed in the claim is old and well known. Since, claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. node level update and modification discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in other nodal management environment, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

AS to claims 25 and 29, see discussion in claim 24 and 28 above. Adaytum further teaches aggregate data from bottom-up and top-down then reconcile over data to achieve final optimization (pp. 30-31), however, Adaytum fails to explicitly disclose the following.

Elkin further teaches node architecture layout wherein the first node comprises a first childe node, wherein the second node comprises a second child node, wherein the hierarchically arranged nodes further comprise a parent node, wherein the enterprise model defines the parent node as a parent to the first child node and the second child node (fig. 8, 9 and 14-15 shows parent/childe node relationship structure), and

Halliday further teaches:

Aggregating data from the first child node and the second child node to form a set of aggregate data set (pp. 4-8 i.e. workflow shows that child node's data are aggregated into data sets from different childe nodes)

Heinl further teaches:

associating the set of aggregate data with the parent node (pp. 84-85 i.e. update nodes are associated with old workflow nodes)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday because Adaytum introduced multiple levels of drill down detail analysis executed by enterprise planning module, but Adaytum fails to explicitly teach detailed node level execution. However, Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday show that node level modification as disclosed in the claim is old and well known. Since, claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. node level update and modification discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in other nodal management environment, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claims 26 and 30, see the discussion in claim 24 and 28 above. While Adaytum discloses all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly disclose the following limitation, however, Heinl further discloses:

receiving a second set of contribution data for the first node before checking-out the first node (pp. 85-86 i.e. cooperative model receives a set of data after modification);

defining a reconciliation job that is configured to cause the application server to prompt to a reviewer to reconcile the second set of contribution data with the modified

version of the first node (pp. 85-86 i.e. user needs to decide between 3 options including overwrite, save new version, or save variant);

receiving a response from reviewer indicating acceptance or rejection of the second set of contribution data for the modified version of the first node (pp. 85-86 i.e. user's choice will result in different workflow structure that indicates acceptance or rejection of second set of the contribution data)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday because Adaytum introduced multiple levels of drill down detail analysis executed by enterprise planning module, but Adaytum fails to explicitly teach detailed node level execution. However, Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday show that node level modification as disclosed in the claim is old and well known. Since, claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. node level update and modification discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in other nodal management environment, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claims 27 and 31, see the discussion in claim 24 and 28 above. While Adaytum discloses all the limitations above, Adaytum fails to explicitly disclose the following limitation, however, Heinl further discloses:

updating a slice of the workflow model corresponding to the first node to form the modified version of a first child node while the first child node is checked out (Heinl at 80, first column, noting that modifications to the workflow occur in real-time, that is, while the model is still running; Halliday § 2.3 - Flexibility by adaptation: Dynamic Reconfiguration, noting tasks are modified and pp. 85-86 shows modified version of different child node i.e. variant).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adaytum with Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday because Adaytum introduced multiple levels of drill down detail analysis executed by enterprise planning module, but Adaytum fails to explicitly teach detailed node level execution. However, Elkin, Heinl, and Halliday show that node level modification as disclosed in the claim is old and well known. Since, claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately i.e. node level update and modification discussed by Elkin, Heinl and Halliday will perform the same function in the enterprise planning system as in other nodal management environment, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN whose telephone number is (571)270-7054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth V. Boswell can be reached on (571)272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623